Appl. No. 10/620,182

Amdt. dated August 27, 2004

Reply to Office action of April 27, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-11 and 15-20 remain in this application. Claims 12-14 have been cancelled.

The examiner rejected claims 1 and 7 as being anticipated by Lyrette. In response, claim 1 has been amended to claim that the pivoting assembly restrains "the angular range of motion of the handle relative to the toilet seat such that the pivoting assembly supports the handle upward when the toilet seat is in the down position". In other words, as shown in Figure 1 of the application, the handle can be supported nearly vertically. This puts the handle in easy reach of a user about to lift the seat.

Lyrette does not show a pivoting assembly that restrains "the angular range of motion of the handle relative to the toilet seat such that the pivoting assembly supports the handle upward when the toilet seat is in the down position". As shown in Figure 1 of Lyrette and as described in the corresponding text (col. 3, lines 20-50), when in the down position, the handle rests in a position "parelleling the undersurface of the seat". A seemingly awkward kneeing of the handle is required to lift the handle to a position where the user can grasp.

Claim 1 additionally claims that the pivoting assembly supports "the handle angled outward relative to the toilet's tank when the toilet seat is in the up

Appl. No. 10/620,182

Amdt. dated August 27, 2004

Reply to Office action of April 27, 2004

position". For example, as shown in Figure 1 of the application, the handle extends away from the tank, in a position to be conveniently grasped when the toilet seat is to be lowered. Lyrette, however, does not position the handle in front of the tank when the toilet seat is up.

Independent claim 7 has been amended similarly to claim 1.

Applicant respectfully requests that a Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Scott Mantell

617-623-8950